

REMARKS

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) since the Examiner contends that the steps of joining the ends of the two or more narrower webs as disclosed in claims 13, 14 and 18. Applicants have amended the application by adding Figures 4-7 which illustrate the two claimed method of joining the ends of the slit webs.

The specification has been amended accordingly to conform the specification to the new drawings. No new matter has been added since the original claims provide the necessary antecedent support.

Based on the foregoing, the objection should be withdrawn.

The rejection to claim 26 is now moot in view of the cancellation of claim 26.

Claims 12-16, 18 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Anmelder (DE 198 03 837). More specifically, the Examiner is concentrating on Fig. 5 of this reference where a plurality of folding devices (100) are provided and arranged in a cascading, staggered manner. A rolled-up web (1) is provided and is fed through idler rolls (21) that tensions the web (1) and then the web (1) is fed to a slitter (23) that slits the web (1) into narrow, individual webs (1). Next, each individual web is fed into one device (100) where the individual web (1) is folded in a zig-zag manner. The device 100 is neither constructed nor is it contemplated that one device 100 receives a plurality of adjacent strips and folds the strips.

Thus, the Anmelder reference is very clear that while "adjacent" strips of web material can be folded, the manner they are folded, which is illustrated in Fig. 5, is substantially different than the manner of folding according to the present invention and as set forth in amended claim 12. More specifically, Fig. 5 of the Anmelder reference does not truly show an apparatus (or method) where adjacent narrow, slit webs are simultaneously folded to form adjacent stacks.

Claim 27 has been added by way of this amendment and consideration and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited. The method of claim 27 should be allowed for the same reasons discussed above with reference to claim 12, as well as the additional reasons that the folding step of claim 27 and the step of delivering the narrower webs to a single container during the folding step resulting in the adjacent stacks being disposed within the single container are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited reference. More specifically, the joining arrangement of Fig. 4C of the Anmelder reference is different as explained above and it is also performed after the stacks have been folded independently and are later merely arranged side-by-side. In contrast, claim 27 recites that the folding of the narrow webs into adjacent stacks occurs within a single container (package). This feature is not shown in the reference. Support for this feature is found on page 4, lines 18-34 of the present application.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: December 21, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Edward J. Ellis

Registration No.: 40,389

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 753-6237 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

Attachments

